

A Plan to Efficiently and Conveniently Unbundle Car Parking Costs

Paper 2010-A-554-AWMA

Mike R. Bullock

Retired Satellite Systems Engineer (36 years), 1800 Bayberry Drive, Oceanside, CA 92054

Jim R. Stewart, PhD

University of the West, 1409 N. Walnut Grove Avenue, Rosemead, CA 91770

ABSTRACT

The *Introduction* shows documented driving reductions due to the pricing of parking. It notes that although the benefits of priced and shared parking are known, such parking has not been widely implemented, due to various concerns. It states that a solution, called “*Intelligent Parking*,” will overcome some of these concerns, because it is easy to use and naturally transparent. It asserts that this description will support a “Request for Proposal” (RFP) process. Eight background information items are provided, including how priced parking would help California achieve greenhouse gas reduction targets. A story demonstrates some of the key features of *Intelligent Parking*. Arguments for less parking, shared parking, and priced parking are made. Barriers to progress are identified. The fair pricing of parking is described. New ways to characterize transportation demand management are presented. Seven goals of *Intelligent Parking* are listed. Eleven definitions and concepts, that together define *Intelligent Parking*, are described. This includes a method to compute a baseline price of parking and how to adjust that price instantaneously to keep the vacancy above 15% (“Congestion Pricing”). An implementation strategy is described.

INTRODUCTION:

It has been well established that appropriately priced parking will significantly reduce driving¹. Most case studies presented in Table 1 are evaluations of the most general type of “car-parking cash-out”: *a program that pays employees extra money each time they get to work without driving*. They show that a price differential between using parking and not using parking will significantly reduce driving, even when transit is described as poor. Since driving *must* be reduced², the pricing of parking is desirable.

Shared parking is also recognized as desirable because it can sometimes result in less parking being needed.

Although the advantages of pricing and sharing parking have been recognized for many years, these practices are still rare. This paper identifies some of the reasons for this lack of progress. The pricing and sharing method of this paper has a natural transparency and ease of use that would reduce many of the concerns. This paper also suggests that those governments that have the necessary resources can take the lead role in developing and implementing the described systems. These governments will recover their investments, over time.

This paper describes how parking facilities could be tied together and operated in an optimum system, named *Intelligent Parking*. The description of *Intelligent Parking* is sufficient to support a “Request for Proposal” process, leading to full implementation.

There are two distinct parts to *Intelligent Parking*. The first is how to set the price. The second is how to distribute the earnings. Briefly, the earnings go to the individuals in the group for whom the parking is built.

Table 1 Eleven Cases of Pricing Impact on Parking Demand

Location	Number of Workers @ Number of Firms	1995 \$'s Per Mo.	Parking Use Decrease
<i>Group A: Areas with poor public transportation</i>			
West Los Angeles	3500 @ 100+	\$81	15%
Cornell University, Ithaca, NY	9000 Faculty & Staff	\$34	26%
San Fernando Valley, Los Angeles	850 @ 1	\$37	30%
Costa Mesa, CA	Not Shown	\$37	22%
Average for Group		\$47	23%
<i>Group B: Areas with fair public transportation</i>			
Los Angeles Civic Center	10,000+ @ "Several"	\$125	36%
Mid-Wilshire Blvd, Los Angeles	1 "Mid-Size" Firm	\$89	38%
Washington DC Suburbs	5,500 @ 3	\$68	26%
Downtown Los Angeles	5,000 @ 118	\$126	25%
Average for Group		\$102	31%
<i>Group C: Areas with good public transportation</i>			
U. of Washington, Seattle, WA	50,000 employees, students	\$18	24%
Downtown Ottawa, Canada	3,500 government staff	\$72	18%
Bellevue, WA	430 @ 1	\$54	39%*
Average for Group, except Bellevue, WA Case*		\$45	21%
Overall Average, Excluding Bellevue, WA Case*			25%

* Bellevue, WA case was not used in the averages because its walk/bike facilities also improved and those improvements could have caused part of the decrease in driving.

PERTINENT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) are a major cause of global warming and pollution^{2,3}.
- California's Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) will need to adopt strategies that reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT), in order to meet SB375 GHG reduction targets, to be issued by the California Air Resources Board in late 2010, for years 2020 and 2035².
- The appropriate pricing of parking is one of the least costly documented tools to reduce VMT.
- New technologies, such as sensors feeding computer-generated billing, offer the potential to efficiently bill drivers for parking and alert law enforcement of trespassers.
- Reformed parking policies can increase fairness, so that, for example, people who use transit or walk do not have to pay higher prices or suffer reduced wages, due to parking.

- Methods to unbundle parking cost are inefficient unless they support the spontaneous sharing of parking spaces. Shared parking with unbundled cost would ultimately allow cities to require significantly less parking.
- Typical systems of timed parking and metered parking are far from ideal. Parking has no automated record keeping, so it is difficult to know where there is too much or too little.
- Good policies will eventually let cities turn parking minimums into parking maximums.

A GLIMPSE INTO A POSSIBLE FUTURE

Jason is driving to work for the first time in several years. He has decided to save money by carrying home a new 3-D, big-screen computer, which he plans to purchase at a store near his office after work. He wanted to avoid paying delivery charges.

Things have been changing around his office development since they unbundled the cost of parking at the near-by train station. Many people who caught the early trains and lived close to the station stopped driving and parking in the best parking spaces; demand for housing close to the station went up; and wealthy riders, who insisted on driving, did so, confident that they could always find parking as close to the platform as their schedules required, due to congestion pricing. Who would have guessed how much those people were willing to pay? It was shocking. Parking-lot earnings, paid to round-trip train riders, meant that the net cost to ride the train went significantly down. Ridership and neighborhood vitality both went significantly up. All Jason knew was that the price to park at his office had been going up yearly because of increased land values. His parking-lot earnings from his office had been increasing almost every month, due to the ripple effect of train riders parking off-site at cheaper parking. Some of them were using his office parking.

As he pulls out of his driveway, he tells his GPS navigation unit his work hours (it already knew his office location), the location of the store where he plans to buy the computer, and his estimated arrival and departure times at the store. He tells the GPS unit he wants to park once, park no more than 1 block from the store, walk no more than 1 mile total, and pay no more than an average of \$2 per hour to park. He is not surprised to hear the GPS tell him that his request is impossible. He tells the GPS he will pay an average of \$3 per hour and learns that the GPS has located parking.

It guides him into a church parking lot. He hopes the church will use his money wisely. The GPS tells him the location of a bus stop he could use to get to work and the bus's next arrival time at the stop. With automatic passenger identification and billing, the bus has become easy to use, except that it is often crowded. Jason gets out of the car and walks to work, with no action required regarding the parking.

Three weeks later, when Jason gets his monthly statement for his charges and income for automotive road use, transit use, parking charges, and parking earnings, he finds that the day's parking did indeed cost about \$30 for the 10 total hours that he parked. He notes that the parking-lot earnings for his office parking averaged about \$10 per day that month. He then notices the parking lot earnings from the store, where he spent about \$1000 dollars. He sees that the parking-lot earnings percent for the store that month was 1.7%, giving him about \$17. So for the day, Jason only spent a net of about \$3 on parking. Then he realized that he should have had the computer delivered after all. If he would have bicycled that day, as he usually did, he would have still gotten the \$27 earnings from the two parking facilities and he would have paid nothing

for parking. So the choice to drive cost him \$30. He remembers that the delivery would have only been \$25 dollars. Oh well. He enjoyed his before-work and after-work walks.

THE CASE FOR LESS PARKING

Less parking will support more compact development.¹ This makes walking and biking more enjoyable and less time consuming. There would certainly be less “dead space”, which is how parking lots feel to people, whether they arrive by car or not, after they become pedestrians.

Since parking can be expensive, less parking can reduce overhead costs significantly, such as leasing expense and parking-lot maintenance cost. Less overhead means more profit and less expense for everyone. A need for less parking can create redevelopment opportunities at existing developments and reduce project cost at new developments.

At new developments, car-parking costs could prevent a project from getting built.²

THE CASE FOR SHARED PARKING

Shared parking for mixed uses means that less parking is needed. For example, shared parking could be used mostly by employees during the day and mostly by residents at night.

Fully shared parking means that very little parking would be off limits to anyone. In a central business district with shared parking, drivers would be more likely to park one time per visit, even when going to several locations. Pedestrian activity adds vitality to any area.

THE CASE FOR APPROPRIATELY-PRICED PARKING

To Reduce Driving Relative to Zero Pricing

Traditional Charging or Paying Cash-out Payments

As shown in the Introduction, this relationship (pricing parking reduces driving) is not new.³

Using results like Table 1, at least one study⁴ has used an assumption of widespread pricing to show how driving reductions could help meet greenhouse gas (GHG) target reductions. Dr. Silva Send of EPIC <http://www.sandiego.edu/epic/ghgpolicy/> assumes that all work locations with 100 employees or more in San Diego County will implement cash-out, to result in 12% less driving to work. Currently, almost all employees in San Diego County “park for free”, unless they happen to work in a downtown core area.

¹ This is especially true of surface parking, which only accommodates 120 cars per acre.

² On September 23, 2008, a panel of developers reviewed the Oceanside, Ca. “Coast Highway Vision” http://www.ci.oceanside.ca.us/pdf/chv_finalvisionstrategicplan.pdf. Parts of this plan were described as smart growth.

At the review, developer Tom Wiegel said, “Parking is the number 1 reason to do nothing,” where “do nothing” meant “build no project.” The other developers at the meeting agreed.

³ For many years the Victoria Transport Policy Institute (VTPI) has been recognized as a source of reliable information on “Transportation Demand Management”, or TDM.

From http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm72.htm#_Price_Parking:

Even a relatively small parking fee can cause significant travel impacts and provide significant TDM benefits. “TDM Benefits” refers to the many public and private benefits of having fewer people choosing to drive.

Current, Best-Practice “Unbundling”

The “best-practice” use of the phrase, “unbundled parking cost”, is to describe the case where either the cost of parking, for the case of a condominium, or the rent for parking, for the case of an apartment, is separated from either the purchase price and common fees or the rent of the dwelling unit.

This gives the resident families the choice of selecting the number of parking spaces they would like to rent or buy, including the choice of zero. This would tend to reduce the average number of cars owned per dwelling unit and, in this way, would also tend to reduce driving. Its major drawback is that this method does not encourage sharing.

To Increase Fairness and Protect the US Economy

It is stated above that almost all employees in San Diego County “park for free”. Of course there is really no such thing as “parking for free”. So-called “free parking” always reduces wages or increases costs. At a work site, it reduces everyone’s wage, even those employees that never drive. At an apartment complex, so-called “free parking” increases the rent. Therefore, “free parking” at work or at apartments violates the fundamental rule of the free market, which is that people should pay for what they use and not be forced to pay for what they do not use. Parking should at least be priced to achieve fairness to non-drivers.

The US economy would also benefit. Reductions in driving would lead to reductions in oil imports, which would reduce the US trade deficit.⁴

BARRIERS TO PROGRESS

Given all this, it might seem that the widespread pricing of parking should have happened by now. However there are barriers. In 2007, a majority of the City Council of Cupertino, Ca. indicated that they wanted their City Manger to negotiate reduced parking requirements with any company that would agree to pay sufficient cash-out payments. To this date, no company, including Apple Inc., has expressed an interest. Most companies probably perceive cash-out as expensive. Even if they realize they could get a reduced parking requirement in exchange for paying sufficient cash-out amounts and even if the economics worked in support of this action (quite possible where land is expensive), they want to stay focused on their core business, instead of getting involved in new approaches to parking, real estate, and redevelopment.

On the other hand, simply charging for parking and then giving all the employees a pay raise is probably going to run into opposition from the employees, who will feel that they would be losing a useful benefit.

In addition, neighbors fear the intrusion of parked cars on their streets. Permit parking, which could offer protection, is not always embraced. City Council members know that a sizable fraction of voting citizens believe that there can actually never be too much “free parking”,

⁴ From http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Balance_of_trade#Warren_Buffett_on_trade_deficits, Warren Buffet wrote in 2006,

“The U.S. trade deficit is a bigger threat to the domestic economy than either the federal budget deficit or consumer debt and could lead to political turmoil. Right now, the rest of the world owns \$3 trillion more of us than we own of them.”

Professor Shoup's famous book⁵ notwithstanding. Some Council members probably feel that way themselves.

It doesn't help that current methods of charging for downtown parking are often very inefficient.⁵ For example, downtown Oceanside, California has parking meters that will only accept coins. Besides this, all their on-street, downtown parking is timed, with maximums from 10 minutes to 4 hours. These time limits are enforced by a city employee, who applies chalk from a tire to the street and then records the time. However, by watching the time and moving their car soon enough, drivers can avoid getting a ticket. Of course, they could instead drive to the mall and not have to worry about having coins or elapsed time since parking. It is not surprising that downtown merchants often object to charging for parking.

In summary, those that resist charging for parking, *based on their perceptions*, include

- Companies, *who fear the complexity and expense of paying cash-out payments*;
- Employees, *who fear of losing a current benefit*;
- City leaders, *who fear the political repercussions*;
- Downtown patrons, *who dislike the inconvenience and worry*;
- Downtown business owners, *who fear that it will drive away customers*.

THE COST, VALUE, AND FAIR PRICE OF PARKING

Estimated and Actual Capital Cost

Surface Parking

One acre of surface parking will accommodate 120 cars. Land zoned for mixed use is sometimes expensive. At \$1.2 million per acre, the land for a single parking space costs \$10,000.

Construction cost should be added to this to get the actual, as-built cost of each parking space. Estimated cost can be determined by using appraised land value and construction estimates. For new developments, after the parking is constructed, it is important to note the actual, as-built cost.

Parking-Garage Parking

One acre of parking-garage will accommodate considerably more than 120 cars. The construction cost of the garage and the value of its land can be added together to get the total cost. Dividing that total cost by the number of parking spaces yields the total, as-built cost of each parking space. Adding levels to a parking garage may seem like a way to cut the cost of each parking space, for the case of expensive land. However, there is a limit to the usefulness of this strategy because the taller the parking garage, the more massive the supporting structural members must be on the lower levels, which increases total cost. Parking-garage parking spaces are often said to cost between \$20,000 and \$40,000. The actual costs should be noted.

Underground Parking

In order to compute an estimate for the cost of a parking space that is under a building, it is necessary to get an estimate of the building cost with and without the underground parking. The difference, divided by the number of parking spaces, yields the cost of each parking space. The

⁵ According to Bern Grush, Chief Scientist of Skymeter Corporation <http://www.skymetercorp.com/cms/index.php>, often two-thirds of the money collected from parking meters is used for collection and enforcement costs.

cost or value of land plays no role in the cost of this parking. However, it does not follow that this parking is cheap. Underground parking spaces are often said to cost between \$60,000 and \$90,000 dollars each. Although there will be an “as built” cost of the building with the parking, there will never be an “as built” cost of the building without the parking. However, after the construction is done, the estimate for the cost of the underground parking should be reconsidered and re-estimated if that is needed. The final, best-estimate cost should be noted.

Value

Initially, value and cost are the same. For surface parking and parking-garage parking, the value would initially be the same as the as-built cost. For underground parking, the value would initially be the same as the best-estimate cost. However, over time, the value must be updated. Both construction costs and land-value costs will change. The value assigned to a parking place should always be based on the current conditions.

Fair Pricing

Parking space “values”, as described above, must first be converted to a yearly price by using a reasonable conversion factor. This conversion factor could be based on either the “cost of money” or the “earnings potential of money”. It is expected that this conversion factor would be 2% to 5% during times of low interest rates and slow growth; but could be over 10% during times of high-interest and high growth. For example, if the surface parking value is \$12,000 and it is agreed upon to use 5% as the conversion factor, then each parking spot should generate \$600 per year, just to cover capital costs. The amount needed for operations, collection, maintenance, depreciation, and any special applicable tax is then added to the amount that covers capital cost. This sum is the amount that needs to be generated in a year, by the parking space.

The yearly amount of money to cover capital cost needs to be re-calculated every year or so, since both the value and the conversion factor will, in general, change each year. The cost of operations, collection, maintenance, depreciation, and any special applicable tax will also need to be reconsidered.

Once the amount generated per year is known, the base price, per unit year, can be computed by dividing it (the amount generated per year) by the estimated fraction of time that the space will be occupied, over a year. For example, if a parking space needs to generate \$900 per year but it will only be occupied 50% of the time, the time rate charge is \$1800 per year. This charge rate per year can then be converted to an hourly or even a per-minute rate. The estimated fraction of time that the parking is occupied over a year will need to be reconsidered at least yearly.

NEW DEFINITIONS TO PROMOTE AN OBJECTIVE VIEW OF PRICING

- The “fair price” means the price that accounts for all costs.
- The “baseline amount of driving” means the driving that results from the application of the fair price.
- “Zero transportation demand management” (“zero TDM”) is the amount of demand management that results when the fair price is used. It will result in the baseline amount of driving.
- “Negative TDM” refers to the case where the price is set below the fair price. This will cause driving to exceed the baseline amount. Since TDM is commonly thought to be an action that reduces driving, it follows that negative TDM would have the opposite effect.
- “Positive TDM” refers to the case where the price is set above the fair price. This would cause the amount of driving to fall below the baseline amount.

Clearly, so-called “free parking” is an extreme case of negative TDM. The only way to further encourage driving would be to have a system that pays a driver for the time their car is parked.

THE GOALS OF *INTELLIGENT PARKING*

- There is only one agency operating all parking. (“All parking” does not include driveways and garages in single-family homes.) *Intelligent Parking* is designed and installed by regional or state government, using low-bid contractors, with design and start-up costs covered by the overhead portion of collection fees.
- Nearly all parking is shared. Almost always, anyone can park anywhere. Those who want exclusive rights to parking will pay “24/7” (all day, every day).
- Parking is operated so that the potential users of parking will escape the expense of parking by choosing to not use the parking. This characteristic is named “unbundled” because the cost of parking is effectively unbundled from other costs.
- Parking is priced and marketed to eliminate the need to drive around looking for parking.
- Parking at any desired price is made as easy as possible to find and use.
- Records of the use of each parking space are kept, to facilitate decisions to either add or subtract parking spaces.
- The special needs of disabled drivers, the privacy of all drivers, and, if desired, the economic interests of low-income drivers are protected.

DEFINITIONS & CONCEPTS OF *INTELLIGENT PARKING*

Parking Beneficiary Groups

There are at least 7 types of beneficiary groups. Note that in all cases, members of beneficiary groups must be old enough to drive.

- 1.) People who have already paid for the capital cost of parking. An example of this type of beneficiary group would be the owners of condominiums, where parking has been built and the cost is included in the price of the condominium. Note that although they have technically already paid for the parking, if they borrowed money to pay for some portion of the price, the cost is built into their monthly payment. This illustrates why the value of parking and the cost of borrowing money (rate of return on money) are key input variables to use to compute the appropriate base, hourly charge for parking.
- 2.) People who are incurring on-going costs of parking. An example of this type of beneficiary group is a set of office workers, where the cost of ‘their’ parking is contained in either the building lease or the cost of the building. Either way, the parking costs are reducing the wages that can be paid to these employees.⁶
- 3.) People who are purchasing or renting something where the cost of the parking is included in the price. Examples of this beneficiary group are people that rent hotel rooms, rent an apartment, buy items, or dine in establishments that have parking.

⁶ Such parking is often said to be “for the benefit of the employees”. Defining this beneficiary group will tend to make this statement true, as opposed to the common situation where the employees benefit only in proportion to their use of the parking.

- 4.) People who own off-street parking as a business. They could be the individual investors or could be a government or government-formed entity.
- 5.) People who are said to benefit from parking, even though the money for the parking has been supplied by a source that may have very little relationship to those that are said to benefit. An example of this group would be train riders that make round trips from a station which has parking that is said to be “for riders”. Students at a school with parking would be another example.
- 6.) People who are considered by many to be the logical beneficiaries of on-street parking. Owners of single-family homes are the beneficiaries of the parking that is along the boundaries of their property. The same status is given to residents of multi-family housing.
- 7.) Governments. Since they build and maintain the streets, they should get a significant benefit from on-street parking.

Unbundled Cost and Spontaneous Sharing

“Unbundled cost” means those who use the parking can see exactly what it costs and those who don’t use the parking will either avoid its cost entirely or will get earnings to make up for the hidden parking cost they had to pay. This conforms to the usual rule of the free market where a person only pays for what they choose to use. Unbundled cost is fair.

“Spontaneous sharing” means that anyone can park anywhere at any time and for any length of time. Proper pricing makes this feasible.

How to Unbundle

The method of unbundling can be simply stated, using the concept of “beneficiary group” as discussed above. First, the fair price for the parking is charged. The resulting earnings⁷ amount is given to the members of the beneficiary group in a manner that is fair to each member. Methods are described below.

Why this Supports Sharing

Members of a beneficiary group benefit financially when “their” parking is used. They will appreciate users increasing their earnings. They are also not obligated to park in “their” parking. If there is less-expensive parking within a reasonable distance, they might park there, to save money. This is fine, because all parking is included in the *Intelligent Parking* system.

Computing the Earnings for Individuals

Intelligent Parking must be rigorous in paying out earnings⁷. For a mixed use, the total number of parking spaces must first be allocated to the various beneficiary groups. For example in an office/housing complex, 63.5% of the parking might have been sold with the office. If so, the housing portion must be paying for the other 36.5%. For this case, it would follow that the first step is to allocate 63.5% of the earnings to the workers and 36.5% to the residents.

⁷ The earnings amount is the revenue collected minus the collection cost and any other costs that will have to be paid due to the implementation of *Intelligent Parking*. The costs associated with the parking, paid *before* the implementation of *Intelligent Parking*, should *not* be subtracted from the revenue because they will continue to be paid as they were before the implementation of *Intelligent Parking*. Therefore, these costs will continue to reduce wages and increase the prices of goods and services.

How the monthly earnings are divided up among the members of the beneficiary group depends on the beneficiary group type. For each member, the group's total monthly earnings amount is always multiplied by a quantity and divided by the sum (the sum is the denominator) of that quantity, for all members.

For example, for each employee, the multiplier is the number of hours that the employee worked over the month while the denominator is the total number of hours worked by all employees over the month. At a school, for each student, the numerator is the total time spent at the school, over the month, while the denominator is the sum of the same quantity, for all the students.

For a train station with parking being supplied for passengers that ride on round trips of one day or less, the numerator is the passenger's monthly hours spent on such round trips, over the month; while the denominator is the total number of hours spent by all passengers on such round trips, over the month. Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) units on passengers could support an automated calculation of monthly charges for fares, as well as monthly hours on round trips.

At a shopping center, the numerator is the sum of the money spent by the shopper, over the month, while the denominator is the total amount of money spent by all shoppers over the month.

At a condominium, the numerator is the number of parking places that were paid for (directly or indirectly) by the resident family and the denominator is the total number of parking places at the condominium project; similarly, for apartment complexes.

Where Earnings Are Low

The goal is that if someone doesn't park, they don't pay, either directly or indirectly, because the earnings that they get will balance out their losses (like reduced wages, for example). However, charging for parking that few want to use will not sufficiently compensate the people that have been forced, or are being forced, to pay for such parking. The only remedy in this case is to redevelop the parking or lease the parking in some other way, for storage, for example. The earnings from the new use should go to those that are in the beneficiary group that was associated with the low-performing parking.

Why This Method of Unbundling Will Feel Familiar to Leaders

Developers will still be required to provide parking and will still pass this cost on, as has been discussed. There will be no need to force an owner of an exiting office with parking to break his single business into two separate businesses (office and parking).

Parking beneficiaries are identified that conform to traditional ideas about who should benefit from parking.⁸

Unbundling the Cost of On-Street Parking

The revenue from on-street parking in front of businesses will be split evenly between the city and the business's parking beneficiaries. All of the earnings from on-street parking in front of apartments or single-family homes will be given to the resident families.⁹

⁸ Showing exactly where parking earnings go will reduce the political difficulties of adopting pay parking in a democracy where the high cost of parking is often hidden and rarely discussed.

⁹ Although governments own the streets, often, back in history, developers paid for them and this cost became embedded in property values. Admittedly, how to allocate on-street parking earnings is somewhat arbitrary. With

Special Considerations for Condominiums

Unbundling for a condominium owner means that, although their allocated amount of parking has added to their initial cost, their allocated amount of parking also earns money for them. Unbundling for a condominium could also mean that an owner can choose to have control over a single or several parking places. Such parking spaces could be equipped with a red light and a green light. If the red light is lit, this will mean that the space is not available for parking, except for the person who is controlling the spot. If the green light is lit, it will mean that the space is available to anyone. A space that is being reserved with a red light is charged at the full price to the condominium owner that has control over the space. The owner that controls these spaces can change the state of the parking space (available or not available) by either a phone call, on line, or at any pay station system that might be in use for the system. After condominium owners experience the cost of reserving a space for themselves, they might give up on the idea of having their own, personal, unshared parking space; especially since *Intelligent Parking* will give most owners and their guests all the flexibility they need in terms of parking their cars.

Some people think that condominium parking should be gated, for security reasons. However, parking within parking garages needs to be patrolled at the same frequency level as on-street parking, which is enough to ensure that crime around either type of parking is very rare. Cameras can help make parking garages that are open to the public safe from criminal activity.

Special Considerations for Renters

Unbundling for renters means that, although their allocated amount of parking increases their rent, their allocated amount of parking also earns money for them. Therefore, their traditional rent (includes parking) is effectively reduced by the money earned by those parking spaces allocated to them. Renters will be motivated to either not own a car or to park in a cheaper location. Parking in a cheaper location is not a problem because all parking is part of the *Intelligent Parking* system. Renters will welcome anyone to park in “their” parking, because it will increase their earnings.

Special Considerations for Employers

At first, companies may want the option of offering “free parking” to their employees so as to be able to compete with traditional job sites. This means giving employees that drive every single day an “add-in” amount of pay so that the sum of the add-in and their parking-lot earnings equals their charge, for any given monthly statement. The operator of the parking, which sends out statements, can pay out the “add in” amount, in accordance with the company’s instruction. The company will then be billed for these amounts. There could be no requirement for the company to provide any such “add-in” amount to the employees that don’t drive every day. This would allow the company to treat its every-day drivers better than other employees and so this would be a negative TDM. However, this economic discrimination would be substantially less than the current, status-quo, economic discrimination, where drivers get “free” parking and non-drivers get nothing.

Clusters of Parking

Clusters are a contiguous set of parking spaces that are nearly equal in desirability and thus can be assigned the same price. They should probably consist of from 20 to 40 spaces. For off-street

congestion pricing and efficient methods, governments may earn significantly more than they are under current practices.

parking, they could be on either side of the access lane to the parking spaces, so that an observer could see the 20 to 40 cars, and get a feel for the vacancy rate. At a train station, clusters will normally be organized so that their parking spaces are approximately an equal distance from the boarding area. On-street clusters would normally conform to our current understanding of what a block is, which is to say from one cross street to the next cross street. The width of the street and the length of the block should be taken into account in defining on-street clusters of parking and in deciding if the parking on either side of the street should or should not be in the same cluster of parking spaces.

Examples of Good and Bad Technology

Parking Meters or Pay Stations

Parking meters are a relic of an earlier period, before computers. Pay stations do not add enough usefulness to merit their inclusion in *Intelligent Parking*, except as a bridge technology. Once good systems are set up, pay stations should cost additional money to use because of their expense. It would be best to devise an implementation strategy that will minimize their use when the system is first put into effect and will take them out of service as soon as possible.

Radio Frequency Identification Backed Up by Video-Based “Car Present” and License Recognition

Government will eventually enter into an RFID (Radio Frequency Identification) age. Organizers of large athletic events already have. Organizers that put on large open-water swims, foot races, and bike rides have routinely used RFID for many years.¹⁰ An RFID vendor in San Diego¹¹ states that passive RFID units cost less than \$5, are reliable, are durable, and they could be used to identify cars as well as people. He also sees no problem in implementing most of the features of *Intelligent Parking*.¹²

Automatic Data Collection and Sending Out Statements

Note that the “back end database” of Dr. Carta’s written statement¹² refers to the ability to send statements of earnings and billing to students.¹³

¹⁰ For example, over 20,000 people ran the 2008 Bay-to-Breakers foot race in San Francisco. Each runner had a “chip” in their shoe lace. Each runner’s start time and finish time were recorded and all results were available as soon as the last runner crossed the finish line.

¹¹ David R. Carta, PhD, CEO Telaeris Inc., 858-449-3454

¹² Concerning a Final Environmental Impact Report-approved and funded new high school in Carlsbad, California, where the School Board has signed a *Settlement Agreement* to consider “*unbundled parking*”, “*cash-out*”, and “*pricing*”, Dr. Carta wrote, in a January 13th, 2010 written statement to the Board,

I wanted to send a quick note discussing the technical feasibility of tracking cars into a lot without impacting students or requiring the need for gates. Mike Bullock and I have discussed this project; it can be accomplished straightforwardly by utilizing Radio Frequency Identification and/or Video Cameras integrated with automated license recognition systems. The cars would need to register with the system at the start, but it would be fairly painless for the users after the initial installation. The back end database system can also be implemented both straightforwardly and at a reasonable price.

This is not necessarily a recommendation of the proposal for unbundled parking. Rather it is strictly an unbiased view of the technical feasibility of the proposal to easily and unobtrusively track cars, both registered and unregistered, into a fixed lot.

¹³ In an earlier email on this subject, Dr. Carta wrote,

Putting it Together

Certainly, government, and in particular transit agencies and parking agencies, could use RFID-based technology. For example, when a person with an RFID unit which is tied to a billable address or a credit card with an open account gets on a bus or a train, they should not have to pay at that time, visit a pay station, or “swipe a card” that has a positive balance. Utility customers that pay their bills are not required to pre-pay. The same courtesy should be extended to transit riders, people that drive on roads, people that get parking-lot earnings, and people that park cars. There should be one monthly bill or statement, for all four activities.

Global Positioning Systems GPS

An alternative model is to have GPS systems in cars that would detect the car’s parking location, that location’s current charge rate, and would perform all of the charging functions in the car. The only information the parking-lot-enforcement system would need is whether or not a car being parked is owned by a bill-paying owner. The car owner’s responsibility would be to pay the bills indicated by the box in the car. The box would need to process a signal that a bill had been paid. It would also need to process pricing signals.

Not Picking Winners

The purpose of this report is to describe what an ideal system would do, *not* how it is done. How a proposed system works is left to the systems, software, and hardware engineers that work together to submit a proposal based on this description of what an ideal system does.

Privacy

Privacy means that no one can see where someone has parked, without a search warrant. Also, the level of the detail of information that appears on a bill is selected by the customer.¹⁴

Ease of Use for Drivers

For credit-worthy drivers that have followed the rules of the system, pay parking will not require any actions other than parking. Paying for all parking fees over a month is then done in response to a monthly billing statement. Parking will feel to the consumer like a service provided by a municipality, such as water, energy, or garbage. One important difference is that users belonging to a “beneficiary group” will get an earnings amount in their monthly statement. Those that earn more than what they are charged will receive a check for the difference. This ease of use will make all parking less stressful.

Base Price

Off-Street

This is not too tough - we probably would integrate with a service that already sends physical mail from an electronic submission instead of re-inventing this wheel.

¹⁴ License plates that have no RFID tags fail to use the best technology to accomplish the primary purpose of license plates, which is to identify and help intercept cars used in a crime. Identifying cars is a legitimate government goal. Protecting privacy is also a legitimate goal. Both goals can be realized with good laws, good enforcement, and good systems engineering.

Off-street parking is priced so that even if demand does not threaten to fill the parking beyond 85%, the money generated will at least equate to an agreed-upon return on the parking value and pay all yearly costs. Equation 1 shows the calculation of the hourly rate.

$$r_{BaselineHourly} = \frac{(r_{Investment} \times v_{Parking}) + c_{YOPD}}{(n_{HoursPerYear} \times f_{TO})} \quad (\text{Eq. 1})$$

where:

$r_{BaselineHourly}$	=	the computed baseline hourly rate to park
$r_{Investment}$	=	yearly return on investment, such as .06
$v_{Parking}$	=	value of a parking space, such as (parking garage) \$40,000
c_{YOPD}	=	yearly operations ¹⁵ plus depreciation, per space, such as \$100
$n_{HoursPerYear}$	=	number of hours per year, 24 x 365 = 8760 Hours per Year
f_{TO}	=	fraction of time occupied, such as 0.55.

For the example values given, the base hourly rate of parking, to cover the cost of the investment, operations¹⁵, and depreciation is \$0.519 per hour. This could be rounded up to \$0.52 per hour. This price could also be increased to result in positive TDM, to reduce driving more than the fair-price, zero-TDM amount.

On-Street

If on-street parking is located within walking distance (one-quarter mile) of off-street parking, its base price is set equal to the closest off-street parking's base price. Otherwise, it is set to some agreed-upon value, like fifty cents per hour. However, on-street parking has a special meaning for downtown merchants and for neighborhoods, two powerful political forces in any city. Merchants that have few cars parking on their street, even though it is permitted, are probably failing in their businesses. They would like free parking to help draw visitors to their store front. Neighborhoods that are not impacted by parking would probably prefer no pricing. For these reasons, for any on-street parking cluster, no price is charged until the cluster occupancy reaches 50%. (Time of day is irrelevant.)

Congestion Pricing

The time-rate price of parking is dynamically set on each cluster of parking, to prevent the occupancy rate from exceeding 85% (to reduce the need to drive around looking for parking). An 85% occupancy rate (15% vacancy) results in just over one vacant parking space per city block⁵. If the vacancy rate is above 30%, the price is left at the baseline hourly rate. If vacancies fall below 30%, the price can be calculated in a stair-step method, such as shown in Table 2.

Equation 2 is an alternative method.

In either case, the total charge is time parked, multiplied by the time-averaged, time-rate price. The base multiplier would be adjusted to be just large enough to keep the vacancy rate from falling below a desired level, such as 15%, so it is always easy to find parking.

¹⁵ This includes money for policing, cleaning, maintenance, any applicable parking tax, and all collection costs. Collection costs will need to include an amount to recover the development and installation costs of *Intelligent Parking*.

Table 2 Hourly Rates for 2 Base Multipliers and a Baseline Hourly Rate of \$0.52

Vacancy Rate	Base Multiplier = 2			Base Multiplier = 2.5		
	Multiplication		Hourly Rate	Multiplication		Hourly Rate
	Formula	Value		Formula	Value	
Above 30%	2 ⁰	1	\$0.52	2 ⁵⁰	1	\$0.52
25% to 30%	2 ¹	2	\$1.04	2 ⁵¹	2.5	\$1.30
20% to 25%	2 ²	4	\$2.08	2 ⁵²	6.25	\$3.25
15% to 20%	2 ³	8	\$4.16	2 ⁵³	15.625	\$8.13
10% to 15%	2 ⁴	16	\$8.32	2 ⁵⁴	39.0625	\$20.31
5% to 10%	2 ⁵	32	\$16.64	2 ⁵⁵	97.6563	\$50.78
Below 5%	2 ⁶	64	\$33.28	2 ⁵⁶	244.1406	\$126.95

$$r_{\text{HourlyRate}} = r_{\text{BaselineHourly}} \times (B^{(30-V)/5}), \text{ for } V < 30; r_{\text{BaselineHourly}}, \text{ otherwise (Eq. 2)}$$

where:

$r_{\text{HourlyRate}}$ = the congestion-priced hourly rate to park

$r_{\text{BaselineHourly}}$ = the baseline hourly rate to park, such as \$0.52 per hour (taken from from Eq. 1.

B = the base of the multiplier being computed, such as 2.50

V = the vacancy rate percent, such as 17.5, for 7 vacancies in a cluster of 40 spaces, $100*(7/40) = 17.5$

For the example values given, the hourly rate of parking would be \$9.88 per hour.

Pricing Predictions and Notifications

Drivers will develop strategies for their routine trips. The computer system that keeps records of parking use will also provide help for users. The *Intelligent Parking* website will direct a user to an appropriate cluster of parking if the user provides the destination location or locations, the time and date, and the hourly rate they wish to pay. If the walk is going to be long, the website could suggest using transit to get from the cheaply-priced parking to the destination. In such cases, the website may also suggest using transit for the entire trip.

Another user option is to specify the time, location, and the distance the user is willing to walk. In this case, the computer would give the cheapest cluster of parking available at the specified walk distance. The price prediction would be provided.

All price predictions would also have a probability of correctness associated with them. If a user can show that a computer has predicted a much lower price than what actually occurred, with a sufficiently high probability, it would be reasonable to charge the user the predicted price rather than the actual price.

Websites could routinely inform viewers when occupancy rates are expected to be unusually high, due to a special event (for example, a sporting event). The parking system website will always give current and predicted hourly rates for all locations. The hourly rates of parking will

also be available at a phone number and possibly at pay stations. The base-price hourly rate, for any parking cluster, would be stable and could therefore be shown on signs. Parking garage entrances could have large video screens showing both predicted and existing price. Users will also learn to look at parking and judge whether congestion pricing applies, or could apply, while their car is parked. It would not be long before these capabilities are added into GPS navigation systems.

Prepaid RFID

To be inclusive, pay stations or convenience stores will offer a pre-paid RFID that can be set on the dashboard of a car. This will support drivers with poor credit or drivers who have not obtained the necessary equipment to support the normal, trouble-free methods. This will also work for drivers that do not trust the system to protect their privacy for a certain trip (by removing or disabling the permanent RFID) or for all trips. No billing would occur.

Enforcement

The system would notify the appropriate law enforcement agency if an unauthorized car was parked. Authorized cars would need either a pre-paid RFID or equipment indicating that their owners had *Intelligent Parking* accounts and were sufficiently paid up on their bills.

IMPLEMENTATION

This description of *Intelligent Parking* will help to implement efficient parking systems. Parking at train stations, schools, and government buildings could introduce many of these concepts. This description of *Intelligent Parking* is sufficient to support a “Request for Proposal” process, which could lead to full implementation. Widespread installation should be done by a government agency, to minimize actions required on the part of the private sector. Laws would simply require the cooperation of all private-sector and government entities.

SUMMARY

A parking plan, *Intelligent Parking* has been described.

1. Technology will make it easy to use for most drivers.
2. Its parking is almost always shared, to support mixed uses.
3. It unbundles cost by charging and having earnings go to the parking beneficiaries.
4. Traditional groups, such as single-family home owners, employees, tenants, train riders, and students benefit from parking. The benefit is equal for drivers and non-drivers.
5. Baseline prices are computed primarily from the value of the parking and an agreed-upon rate of return. On-street parking is free until it is half full, at which time its base price often matches that of the closest off-street parking.
6. For all parking, price is dynamically increased to guarantee availability. Earnings are therefore only limited by what people are willing to pay.
7. Technology helps drivers find parking and decide if they want to drive or use transit.
8. Prepaid RFIDs provide service to those who have poor credit or don't want to be billed.
9. Disabled and perhaps low-income drivers will have accounts that allow them to park at reduced prices and perhaps avoid congestion pricing. Specially designated spots might also be required for disabled drivers.

10. The system will provide reports showing where additional parking would be a good investment and where it would be wise to convert existing parking to some other use.
11. Privacy will be protected. Law enforcement officials would need a search warrant to see where someone's car has been parked. The level of detail on billing would be selected by the car's owner.
12. Implementations could begin in carefully selected locations and expand.

Global warming, air pollution, trade deficits, and fairness are some of the significant reasons that governments have a responsibility to implement *Intelligent Parking*.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The following people have offered encouragement, specific information, and/or special insights.

Dr. Dennis Martinek, Oceanside Planning Commissioner; Sandra Goldberg, California Deputy Attorney General; Jerry Kern, Oceanside, City Council; Amy Volzke, Principal Planner, City of Oceanside; Dr. Nilmini Silva-Send, Senior Policy Analyst of the Energy Policy Initiative Center; Diane Nygaard, Director of Preserve Calavera and founder of Nelson Nygaard, Consulting Associates; Lisa Rodman, Trustee, Carlsbad Unified School District; Dr. Michael McQuary, President, La Jolla Democratic Club; Joan Bullock; Judy Jones, San Diego County Central Committee, California Democratic Party; Patrick Siegman, Principal and Shareholder, Nelson Nygaard; Andy Hamilton, San Diego Air Pollution Control District; Renee Owens, Conservation Chair, San Diego Sierra Club; Caroline Chase, Executive Committee Chair, San Diego Sierra Club; Ed Mainland, Co-Chair, Energy-Climate Committee, Sierra Club California; Bern Grush, Chief Scientist, Skymeter Corporation; and the following San Diego Area Government (SANDAG) employees: Susan Baldwin, Senior Regional Planner; Bob Leiter, former Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning; Coleen Clementson, Principle Planner; and Stephan Vance, Senior Regional Planner.

REFERENCES

- 1 Siegman, P. *How to Get Paid to Bike to Work: A Guide to Low-traffic, High-profit Development; Pro Bike Pro Walk Resource Book*; from the Ninth International Conference on Bicycle & Pedestrian Programs; Sept. 3-6, 1996, Portland, Maine; Bicycle Federation of America Pedestrian Federation of America; pp 171-175.
- 2 Adams, T.; Eaken, A.; Notthoff, A.; *Communities Tackle Global Warming, A Guide to California's SB 375*, June 2009, NRDC; <http://www.nrdc.org/globalWarming/sb375/files/sb375.pdf>.
- 3 Anders, S. J.; De Haan, D. O.; Silva-Send, N.; Tanaka, S.T.; Tyner, L.; *San Diego County Greenhouse Gas Inventory*, September 2008. <http://www.sandiego.edu/epic/ghginventory/>
- 4 Silva-Send, N.; *Reducing Greenhouse Gases from On-Road Transportation in San Diego County*, October 2009. http://www.sandiego.edu/epic/ghgpolicy/documents/ES_GHG_Policy_On-Road_FINAL.pdf
- 5 Shoup, D. *The High Cost of Free Parking*. Chicago University Press, June 7, 2005.

KEYWORDS

A&WMA, Parking, Unbundled, Shared, TDM, cash-out, pricing, beneficiary, greenhouse gas, GHG, GPS, RFID